

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON

BRUCE CORKER d/b/a RANCHO ALOHA; et  
al.,

Plaintiffs,

v.

MULVADI CORPORATION, a Hawaiian  
corporation; et al.,

Defendants.

NO. 2:19-cv-00290-RSL

**ORDER GRANTING BUCHALTER'S  
MOTION FOR *IN CAMERA* REVIEW**

This matter came for hearing on “Buchalter’s Motion for *in Camera* Review of Certain Information Being Submitted in Opposition to Plaintiffs’ Sanctions Motion.” Dkt. # 799. Having considered the submissions of the parties regarding both this motion and the underlying sanctions motion, the Court finds and holds as follows:

1. Buchalter reasonably believes, and the Court finds, that Buchalter’s disclosure to the Court of certain limited confidential discussions it had with its client, Mulvadi Corporation (“Mulvadi”), and Mulvadi’s owner, Steven Mulgrew (hereafter “Confidential Client Communications”), is necessary for Buchalter to respond to Plaintiffs’ Motion for Sanctions against Buchalter (Dkt. # 759). Limited disclosure of such communications are permitted under these circumstances by RPC 1.6(b)(5).
2. Buchalter contends, and the Court finds, that the client’s informed consent to the disclosure would not likely be given in the circumstances presented here.

3. RPC 1.6(c) requires that Buchalter make reasonable efforts to prevent any unauthorized disclosure of, or unauthorized access to, information relating to the representation of a client. As explained in various comments to RPC 1.6, this obligation extends even in circumstances where disclosure is permitted under RPC 1.6(b). An attorney still has an obligation to limit the disclosures only to those with a need to know and to the purposes for which disclosure is made. To this end, Buchalter has requested in this motion that the limited Confidential Client Communications referenced in the brief and declaration it submitted in opposition to Plaintiffs' Sanctions Motion be considered *in camera* so that (i) disclosure of them is limited to those having a need to know, and (ii) to prevent disclosure to any party (namely Plaintiffs) who could potentially use them adversely to Mulvadi in other contexts.

4. Buchalter contends, and the Court finds, that *in camera* review of the Confidential Client Communications will not prejudice plaintiffs

For all of the foregoing reasons, Buchalter's motion is GRANTED. Dkt. # 805 and # 806 shall remain Ex Parte - Sealed documents.

Dated this 26th day of June, 2023.

Robert S. Lasnik  
Robert S. Lasnik  
United States District Judge